



Because Faircloth has not identified a change in the law or newly discovered evidence, the only plausible basis for his motion is that the Court made a clear error of law. But even that ground is without merit. Faircloth provided no compelling basis to grant him relief from judgment. To the contrary, he repeated the same arguments he's made since he first filed his complaint. Faircloth's promise to continue pursuing his case even before the Court dismissed his claims is compelling evidence no extraordinary circumstances exist warranting a relief from the judgment.

Faircloth's motion (Doc. 142) is **DENIED**. Faircloth is not entitled to a list of answers to his various questions. The bases for the Court's rulings have been set out in detail in its orders.

**SO ORDERED**, this 25<sup>th</sup> day of June 2013.

/s/ W. Louis Sands  
**THE HONORABLE W. LOUIS SANDS,**  
**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**